

Pacific School of Religion
1798 Scenic Ave.
Berkeley, California.

Social Questions Bulletin

Volume 45

APRIL, 1955

Number 4

A PEACE APPEAL TO THE PRESIDENT

Protestant Churchmen Oppose Drift Toward War

April 1, 1955

Dear Mr. President: We, the undersigned clergymen, laymen editors of Protestant journals, writing as individuals, are profoundly disturbed by the current drift in Washington toward war. According to *The New York Times* of March 26, 1955, high advisers are suggesting "a strong action" against the Chinese mainland, which has been ominously labeled "Operation China." Some such advisers, said *The Times*, advocate "on an all-out basis" with the objective "to destroy Red China's industrial potential."

We are shocked, Mr. President, that these advisers urge you, have stood always for peace, to consent to all-out war and use of atomic bombs. Such an irresponsible policy would use the United States Government and the American people are the whole world as wanton aggressors.

The *New York Times* dispatch says it is "the conviction official quarters that Russia does not wish to risk a general war" and that "Red China wishes to avoid involvement in a general war."

Why then shall we start all-out war against the Chinese mainland? How, we ask, can the Administration expect to have a broad people behind our foreign policy? There are millions of right Americans whose Christian conscience would never tolerate such an action.

Our advisers say that we are "honor bound" to defend Quemoy and Matsu, and the only way to do it would be to "smash China." There's also talk that we must protect Chiang Kai-shek from "losing face." We think that to risk world-wide atomic war for the prestige of Chiang Kai-shek would not only be a folly, a crime of the first magnitude.

The arguments in favor of waging preventive war are unconvincingly flimsy and faulty. The promoters of the "Smash China" plan predict that Russia would stay out of such a war. As you will recall, our military experts were wrong on China in 1950. We fear that they are blundering again. Why should China, also "honor bound" by treaty, stand idly by and see itself destroyed by atomic bombs?

Mr. President, we implore you to stop this drift toward atomic war. We wholeheartedly agree with a recent editorial in *The New York Times* that it would be "a vast tragedy" if we "stumble into war against the intentions and wishes of the majority of our people and our Allies."

As Christians and citizens we urge you to exercise in this crucial hour your strong leadership for peace. We agree fully with *The New York Times'* editorial which said:

It is time that the fire-eaters in Washington, whether in the Pentagon, or elsewhere, went into silence.
Mr. President: If the world is to be saved from irretrievable disaster, we must begin to think and act positively in terms of peace. As Christians, we know that war, atomic war, will bring destruction. You, Mr. President, said recently that "there is no alternative to peace" and "the concept of atomic war is too terrible for men to endure and to practice; we must find some way out of it."

If we blunder into atomic war, there will be no victors and

The Methodist Federation for Social Action, an unofficial membership organization, seeks to deepen within the Church, the sense of social obligation and opportunity to study, from the Christian point of view, social problems and their solutions and to promote social action in the spirit of Jesus. The Federation stands for the complete abolition of war. The Federation rejects the method of the struggle for profit as the economic base for society and seeks to replace it with social-economic planning to develop a society without class or group discriminations and privileges. In seeking these objectives the Federation does not commit its members to any specific program, but remains an inspirational and educational agency, proposing social changes by democratic decision, not by violence.

few survivors. The only way to find a solution for remaining conflicts is by negotiation.

In years past we negotiated the Berlin Blockade, the thorny question of Trieste, the Korean war, and the jungle war in Indochina. Shall we now plunge mankind into the abyss for the tiny islands of Quemoy and Matsu? These islands are a part of the Chinese mainland and we should evacuate them.

As for Formosa, we must negotiate either on the basis of the "two-China" concept or as a neutralized sanctuary for Chiang Kai-shek under the trusteeship of the United Nations.

Mr. President, as Christians we cannot be silent at this critical juncture of United States history. Our conscience compels us to oppose an aggressive all-out war policy. Your decisions, Mr. President, will not only affect the safety and well-being of 165,000,000 Americans, but your stand for peace will benefit the whole human race.

We beg you, Mr. President, to continue your action for peace, stop the drift toward war, insist on peaceful settlement of differences between nations. The problem of today is not the prestige of Chiang Kai-shek, but the survival of our civilization.

JOHN W. BRADBURY, New York,

Editor, *Watchman-Examiner* (Baptist).

J. TREMAYNE COPPLESTONE, Boston,
Editor, *Zions-Herald* (Methodist).

PHILLIPS PACKER ELLIOTT, Brooklyn,

Pastor, First Presbyterian Church.

CHARLES K. GILBERT,

Protestant Episcopal Bishop of New York (retired).

EMERSON HUGH LALONE, Boston,
Editor, *The Universalist Leader*.

JOHN HOWLAND LATHROP, Brooklyn,

Minister, First Unitarian Church.

JOHN WESLEY LORD, Boston,
Resident Bishop, Methodist Church.

JOHN A. MACKAY,

President, Princeton Theological Seminary.

NORMAN B. NASH, Boston,

Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Massachusetts.

CLARENCE PICKETT.

W. STANLEY RYCROFT, New York,
Board of Missions, Presbyterian Church.

GUY EMERY SHIPLER, New York,
Editor, *The Churchman* (Protestant Episcopal).

JOHN C. SLEMP, New York,

Editor, *Missions* (Baptist).

STANLEY I. STUBER, New York,
Interdenominational Church Editor.

A JOB FOR PEACE FOR YOU

Senator Wayne Morse and Herbert Lehman introduced in Congress an important resolution which needs support. Your card or note to your Senators and Representatives will help. Voice support and demand public hearings through the Senate Foreign Relations Committee,* which received the resolution.

The resolution deals with the immediate war danger at Quemoy and Matsu, and calls for evacuation of these islands, to

which "the U. S. under international law has no territorial rights or claims," a statement we think also applies to Formosa and the Pescadores. As worded, the resolution does not prevent later war for Formosa and the Pescadores as such (a war which MFSA and this Bulletin have also opposed.) But it does, significantly, leave the ultimate status of these larger and more-distant-from-the-mainland islands to be "determined by peaceful processes." Hearings on the resolution, and its passage, would give needed time for negotiating relaxation of tension over the Formosa area.

Meanwhile at the historic Afro-Asian Conference in Bandung, Chinese Premier Chou En-Lai proposed direct negotiations between our government and his "on relaxation of Far Eastern tensions, including those of the Formosa area." The conservative Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Walter George of Georgia, promptly urged our acceptance of Chou's proposal, saying: "We ought to be willing to talk with the Chinese Peoples' Republic and their leaders, because we have a high obligation to all men everywhere. And out of that conference may come, not a final solution, but a step—and perhaps a great step—to a solution of our problems." (AP, April 23.)

Earlier, Senator George had urged similarly Big Four negotiations, including Russia, for peaceful settlement in Europe. These recent stands by Mr. George are in full harmony with the consistent MFSA position and with the past stand of Methodism and organized American Protestantism favoring high-level negotiations for peace.

In addition to supporting the Morse-Lehman resolution, we suggest you voice support to Senator George and urge on President Eisenhower immediate negotiations with the People's Republic of China, towards preventing war and relaxing tension. Text of the Morse-Lehman Resolution is on page 15.

*Its members, to whom you may also write helpfully, are: George, Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Wiley, H. A. Smith, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, Capehart, Morse.

BEHIND THE HEADLINES

Sometimes happenings which are more important than those in the headlines aren't even reported. Such an event was the debate and decision concerning Tanganyika in the U.N. Trusteeship Council. It comes to us only because Eslanda G. Robeson, scholar and author in anthropology and wife of Paul Robeson, is a regular observer at the U.N. and correspondent for a section of the Negro press.

Tanganyika is administered for the U.N. by Great Britain and the Council was receiving the report of its visiting mission. These visits are periodic. The missions interview all sections of the population, receive protests, complaints, suggestions and report their findings. Each mission consists of four members, two each from administering and non-administering powers. This time it was El Salvador and India for the latter, and New Zealand and United States for the former.

A heated debate arose over the recommendation that the eight million Africans in Tanganyika be given independence and self-government within 20 to 25 years. The colonial powers have regularly opposed setting a definite date for independence of the people under their authority. This time Great Britain insisted that she only will know and should say when the people of Tanganyika are "capable and ready" for self-government.

The petitioners were heard. Previously all have been natives of the territory they represented. This time one was the white chairman of the Tanganyika Unofficial Members organization. He opposed the report's recommendations as unrealistic and impractical, said they would "adversely affect the harmonious relationship existing between the various races in the territory" and if adopted would seriously impair its political stability.

The other petitioner, president of the Tanganyika African National Union, replied that by "political stability" the foreign European investor means "political stagnation of the African," keeping him as he now is. He said his organization endorsed the mission report as "a balanced, true, honest and comprehensive study of Tanganyika's problems and solutions," and the vast majority of Africans there approved it. He registered

complete opposition to any further alienation of the land from the natives. "We regard Tanganyika to be primarily African. We do not want non-Africans (who have made Tanganyika their home) to feel foreigners. What we do object to is the attempt by some of them . . . to make us feel foreigners in our country."

The recommendations of the mission report were voted down by a tie vote, 6-6. The Trusteeship Council is composed of 11 members, six states which administer colonies (Australia, Belgium, France, New Zealand, Great Britain, the United States) and six which do not (China, El Salvador, Haiti, India, Syria, the Soviet Union). To approve a resolution or recommendation a majority is required. This time, as frequently before, the colonizing administering states lined up against the non-administering states to defeat the report recommendations.

This result involved a significant incident. The U. S. member of the mission, Mr. Mason Sears, approved its recommendations but, as a member of the Council had, under orders, to vote against them. For the record, he states: "There are several points in the report on which I, as a member of the mission, took a different individual view, but on which my government has reached somewhat different conclusions. My government will not support the time-table principle for Tanganyika."

This whole matter has a bearing upon the destiny shaping question of Formosa. Many church people will favor a proposal to put Formosa under the U.N. Trusteeship Council for a period pending final adjudication. The real government of China has announced its opposition, on the ground that Formosa is an internal issue which does not belong to the U.N. A supporting reason undoubtedly is that they can have no confidence in a procedure which puts final power in the hands of the colonizing governments.

This procedure is not known to many church people. They will see only that "Red" China is rejecting what to them is a prospect for peace. Those who want to hold Formosa under our control will tell them this proves that the Peking support of the World Peace movement was only Communist deception. Those who know the essential facts and judge otherwise will again be labelled as dupes of Red propaganda. So a large part of the world will move nearer the fate of those who perish for lack of knowledge. How great then is the responsibility of those who know the truth to spread it.

H.F.W.

P.S.: I send another item on South Africa. South African government has taken responsibility for African education away from the church mission schools, because, partly subsidized in the past, they are "unsympathetic to the country's policy." Schools time cut in half. Curriculum cut to what will satisfy needs of African child in his segregated community, and such else as to qualify him for manual labor. "It is absurd to teach native general world and academic subjects," says Minister of Education. Father Trevor Huddleston (Anglican?) says: "Here racism at its darkest and most damnable—that evil thing which seeks to direct and dominate even the minds of children. (Compare with attitude in a few Southern states towards opening for Negro pupils the same schools and teachings offered white pupils. Also, how fitting that such a government should want Great Britain and the U. S. A. to join it in a Defense of Africa against Communism pact.)

H.F.W.

SOCIAL QUESTIONS BULLETIN

\$2.00 per year.

25c per copy

Issued monthly, October through May, and one summer issue.

METHODIST FEDERATION for SOCIAL ACTION
(Unofficial)

President, Dr. Loyd Worley; Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Mary Phillips, Rev. Lee H. Ball, Rev. Clarence T. R. Nelson; Recording Secretary, Miss Janice M. Roberts; Treasurer, Rev. Edward Peet.

Membership Secretary, Mark Chamberlin.

Field Secretaries, I. DeQuincy Newman, Willard Uphaus.

Editorial Secretary and Editor, Jack R. McMichael.

Editorial Office and Office of Publication
P. O. Box 327, Gresham, Oregon.

Re-entered as second class matter Sept. 15, 1953, at the Postoffice at Gresham, Oregon, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

PLAN NOW FOR TAHOE, JULY 8-10

Significant planning is underway for the 1955 National Membership meeting of the Methodist Federation for Social Action. The planning committee is headed by Prof. George Collier, President of the host California-Nevada Conference MFSA Chapter. The conference theme will be: "DISARMAMENT AND OTHER ALTERNATIVES TO WAR." Within that framework delegates will face current issues of peace, equality, civil liberties, and economic welfare. Top-flight speakers and resource leaders are being engaged. Food and housing costs are being held to the minimum. Meeting place is Skylandia, Methodist Conference Grounds, Lake Tahoe, California—beautiful and unsurpassed spot for family vacationing. Entire families are welcome. What better chance can you have this summer for fellowship, recreation, inspiration, and creative discussion and action on the most vital issues of our time? The time to register is NOW. We urge you to do so.

To: Methodist Federation for Social Action,
Box 327,
Gresham, Oregon.

I plan to attend the Tahoe meeting with _____ members of my family.

I enclose my registration fee of \$3.00

(Further details will be mailed all registrants. Their speaker and program suggestions, etc., will be welcome.)

SPEECH FOR PEACE AND SANITY

By SENATOR WAYNE MORSE

On April 1, Sen. Wayne Morse spoke in the Senate in support of the Morse-Haman Resolution printed below. Write the Senator for full text of his entire address, excerpts of which we publish here.)

Around the world our allies ask the question, "How can the proposed course of action of the U. S. in regard to Quemoy and the Matsus, in respect to which the U. S. does not have a single legal right under international law, be defended?"

I have been waiting for the Secretary of State to answer a question which I put to him in the Foreign Relations Committee, "What principle of international law justifies the defense

Quemoy and the Matsus by the U. S.?" He did not name principle of international law in justification of our position or he could not. We have no right to defend these coastal islands with respect to which we have no territorial rights. The American people expect their President to stay within international law. He does not understand the principles of international law. If he did he would not have asked Congress for authorization to go outside the framework of international law.

What did he ask for? He asked for authority to strike the mainland of China before an act of war was committed against the U. S. The President sent us a resolution passed by Congress, which the President asked for power to take "such other measures as he judges required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores." A reading of the testimony before the committee which was submitted by the Secretary of State, by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and by other top Administration witnesses, discloses there is in question what they seek to do. They seek authority to exercise the discretionary right to determine when we shall strike the mainland of China before an act of war has been committed against the U. S. When we follow that course we walk outside international law.

That is why Canada, France and Great Britain are making perfectly clear to us that they will not support us in defense of Quemoy and the Matsus. They have no intention of supporting the U. S. in an aggressive course of action with respect to Quemoy and the Matsus, over which we have not a scintilla of legal right.

I think it very important the American people make clear to the President at the earliest possible date the great opposition to his proposal that we follow an aggressive course of action in the mainland of China or in defense of Quemoy and the Matsus, if he decides such a course is necessary. It is time the American people make some decisions about American foreign policy. They cannot decide intelligently unless we in the Con-

gress see to it they have facts about the American foreign policy in Asia.

The American people know Chiang's civil war in China is not a matter in which we should become embroiled. The public is now entitled to know from both the President and the congressional leaders what our policy is going to be in respect to Quemoy and the Matsus.

I am opposed to the President dragging us into the China civil war through any attempt to defend Quemoy and the Matsus. Therefore, I submit to the Senate a concurrent resolution on behalf of myself and the junior senator from New York (Mr. Lehman).

We must make it clear to the Communist world that we stand ready, in cooperation with our Allied friends, to discuss with their top leaders the present danger of war; and once again to take the rules of reason to the issues of peace and war, and demonstrate that it is the U. S. and our allies who seek peace.

We shall not maintain among the allies the unity essential to maintain peace if we follow a course in Asia which our allies cannot support. The President has no right to remain ambiguous any longer about Quemoy and the Matsus. The American people are the ones who will do the dying.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 21

Whereas it is the historic policy of the United States to promote peace throughout the world by urging the settlement of international disputes through juridical processes; and

Whereas the United States has always decried the use of aggression or threats of aggression in foreign affairs; and

Whereas there is now danger of United States involvement in atomic war with the Chinese Communists in defense of the Matsu and Quemoy islands occupied by forces of the Republic of China; and

Whereas the United States under international law has no territorial rights or claims to the Matsu and Quemoy islands; and

Whereas a military defense of said islands by the United States subjects the United States to the charge of acts of aggression and involvement in a Chinese war; and

Whereas the major allies of the United States have declared that they are unsympathetic to and would not support the defense of the Matsu and Quemoy islands; and

Whereas it is the right and policy of the United States under international law to defend Formosa and the Pescadores against communistic attack until such time as its sovereign status is determined by peaceful processes: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(a) the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area," approved January 29, 1955 (Public Law 4, 84th Cong.), shall not be construed to authorize the President to employ any of the Armed Forces of the United States in military operations concerning the Matsu and Quemoy islands;

(b) the existing danger of war could be relieved by the cooperation of the Republic of China in the evacuation of such islands and the safe return of the forces of the Republic of China and the civilian inhabitants to Formosa;

(c) on the basis of such cooperation the President at the earliest practicable time should take appropriate action to lay before the United Nations the danger to the peace of the world presented by the threat of attack upon such islands, with the request that the United Nations undertake the supervision of such evacuation and the removal from those islands of the Republic of China and the civilian inhabitants who may desire to seek refuge elsewhere; and

(d) the Armed Forces of the United States properly may be employed to render assistance which may be required to safeguard such evacuation and removal under such conditions as the United Nations may determine to be necessary to avoid, to the greatest practicable extent, involvement in hostilities with forces of the Chinese Communists.

A STATE LEVEL WITCH HUNT

Summary of Case of Willard Uphaus vs. New Hampshire

By DR. BERT MacLEECH*

In September, 1953, The Manchester Union Leader, one of New Hampshire's leading dailies, ran two feature articles attacking Willard Uphaus, executive director of the World Fellowship of Faiths and the Fellowship itself. Immediately Attorney General Louis C. Wyman announced in the press that he would investigate Dr. Uphaus under New Hampshire's Subversive Activities Act of 1951. And there the threat lay.

The following spring Dr. Uphaus proceeded with plans for the World Fellowship's summer program, which is conducted in a lovely resort setting near Conway, New Hampshire. On May 3, 1954, he and Rev. George A. Ackerly, World Fellowship Advisory Council member, called on Attorney General Wyman to invite him to speak at the Fellowship's Center. He not only declined, but on the spot subpoenaed Dr. Uphaus to appear for questioning on June 3, 1954.

At this "hearing," Dr. Uphaus was quizzed for three hours on his views, peace activities, travels abroad and associations. He declared that his philosophy of life grew out of his convictions. He placed the Bible and the Methodist discipline on the attorney general's desk and indicated that these sources were his guide—rather than Washington or Moscow. Dr. Royal W. France, eminent civil liberties attorney, served as Dr. Uphaus' counsel and following the questioning, he was released from subpoena.

The Fellowship's summer program went forward successfully. Over 100 more guests, of many vocations and ideologies, came to the Center than had vacationed there in 1953. Then, on September 10, 1954, the attorney general struck again. Under this second subpoena, Wyman demanded that Dr. Uphaus turn over the 1954 guest list, the correspondence with prospective speakers, and other information about activities in association with movements for peace and civil rights. Dr. Uphaus refused. He felt that to do this would be to make him a contemptible talebearer against people, who, to his knowledge, had never done anything to injure the state or the country. Dr. France was with him again at the second hearing, and stated that in his judgment the subpoena had been a violation of the First, Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments. Dr. Uphaus read into the record the social teachings of The Methodist Church on civil liberty and also a personal statement of faith which included a defense of World Fellowship as a truly religious movement working for peace and brotherhood.

The attorney general at once petitioned the Court to compel Dr. Uphaus to appear for trial and furnish the information which had been demanded. In this petition, Wyman insinuated that Dr. Uphaus was using his religion as a cover for subversive activities. He exhibited a great lack of knowledge about the teachings and policy of Protestantism when he gave as a reason for inquiring into the membership of World Fellowship the fact that Willard Uphaus is not an ordained minister and never received a degree of Doctor of Divinity, because having received on the contrary, a Ph.D. degree from Yale University in 1925. He overlooked the fact that Protestantism includes many laymen and laywomen who follow full-time religious vocations and that the supremacy of conscience and liberty of private judgment are for them also the very center of its teaching.

The Court set a hearing for November 9, 1954. Dr. France and other attorneys advised Dr. Uphaus that the over-zealous Wyman had no legal rights to bring a Connecticut citizen, who had committed no crime, before the New Hampshire court. The Religious Freedom Committee, a national body of clergymen and laymen organized to defend religious freedom as guaranteed by the First Amendment, concurred in this judgment. Consequently, Dr. Uphaus did not appear, although Mr. Hugh Bownes, a New Hampshire attorney representing him, argued the issue of jurisdiction before the court.

The judge expressed serious doubts on the matter of jurisdiction, but at a second hearing on November 19th, he held Dr. Uphaus in contempt for not appearing and fined him \$500. This decision will be appealed to the State Supreme Court.

The lawyers and the Religious Freedom Committee agree that

the question, of restraining state witch-hunts like that in New Hampshire, is one of principle and must be fought. Dr. Uphaus also feels it essential to fight through on the issue of the First Amendment. The New Hampshire action is a clear violation of freedom of religion, freedom of speech and peaceable assembly. To comply with the demands made would possibly hurt innocent people. To comply would be contrary to the Old Testament teaching, "Thou shalt not go up and down as a talebearer among thy people," and to the many warnings in the New Testament against careless talk.

This case involves serious questions that concern all thoughtful Americans. The First Amendment guarantees freedom of religion. Does the state, then, have a right to interfere with the free exercise of religion, with program and speakers, with free discussion and peaceful assembly? If one compromises at this point, will the inquisition end there? Who will be next?

The country faces a plague of state inquisitions, as experience in Kentucky, Florida and Pennsylvania show. These local inquisitors should be covered with a barrage of telegrams and letters for they tend to think they can carry on their work without the eyes of the nation's freedom loving people being fastened on them.

Dr. MacLeech did graduate work at Union Theological Seminary, New York, 1934-35, at Stanford University, 1938-39, and received the Ed. L. degree from Harvard in 1951. He served as Assistant pastor in three California churches—Burbank Presbyterian Church, 1926-28; Wilshire Presbyterian Church, 1929-30, and Palm Springs Community Church, 1933-34. He was an instructor in American College, Sofia, Bulgaria, 1930-33, and California State Organizer, American League Against War and Fascism, 1935-38. Dr. MacLeech is at present Executive Secretary, Connecticut Volunteers for Civil Rights, with headquarters in New Haven.

Editor's Suggestions to Bulletin readers:

1. Write Gov. Lane Dwinnell and Attorney General Louis C. Wyman, Concord, N. H., strongly protesting this type of persecution.
2. For further information on this civil liberty case and its background order the Reply to the Attorney General of New Hampshire, on behalf of World Fellowship, Inc., and Dr. Willard Uphaus, by Attorney Royal Wilbur France. Single copy postpaid, 25c, and 10 or more for 20c each. World Fellowship, Inc., 66 Edgewood Ave., New Haven 1, Conn.

LETTER FROM MFSA PRESIDENT LOYD WORLEY

Hon. Louis C. Wyman, Attorney General,
Concord, New Hampshire.

March 29, 1955

Dear Sir:

My attention has been called to the fact that you have written me up, with others, in a report to the Legislature of New Hampshire of an investigation of so-called subversive activities. May I state that if all of your report is as inaccurate as the portion which concerns me, it is a ridiculous waste of the taxpayer's money. If you had spent a three cent stamp with an inquiry to me, you could have saved at least two-thirds of the space which you gave me.

If you happened to hear of the hearing granted Bishop Oxnam by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, you would have known that the so-called "file" is not a reliable source of evidence. It does not begin to tell the "whole truth." At least two-thirds of the information which you print about me, for instance, is entirely without foundation. The other one-third can be defended from the standpoint of the Bill of Rights and from the New Testament. This one-third has to do with my relationship with the unofficial Methodist Federation for Social Action. The House Committee on Un-American Activities has admittedly made no investigation of the Federation. The committee "file" might be likened to the scum of gossip from some witches' brew.

Had you been genuinely interested in the real facts about my own attitude toward communism, you could have ascertained, for instance, that I sponsored the resolution in the last General Conference of the Methodist Church which contained the most severe indictment of the police state and totalitarian communist dictatorship which was offered. I have consistently opposed communism but by constructive Christian methods.

The matter which disturbs me most, however, is that you, as the man officially charged with the administration of justice in the state which produced Daniel Webster, could be so unjust as to publish and report what you have about me and others without giving the accused persons a chance to defend themselves.

Very truly yours, LOYD F. WORLEY.